

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 101 as not being a proper process claim and under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claim 10 is herein deleted and claim 15 is added herein.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Moyer et al (US Patent No. 4,078,118). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention discloses a coating composition comprising an oxidatively drying polyunsaturated polymer, a thiol compound, and a photo-initiator. In contrast to the present invention, Moyer relates to a radiation curable composition. No oxidative drying occurs. More specifically, the thiol comprising groups are derived from fatty-acid building blocks. Oxidative drying would require a large number of these groups. Thus, there is no teaching, suggestion, or disclosure in Moyer that would motivate one skilled in the art to replace the radiation curing mechanism of Moyer with oxidative drying. Nor would a skilled artisan desiring an improved oxidatively drying coating composition look to the radiation curable coating of Moyer.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Moyer, further in view of Ostlie (US Patent No. 5,876,805). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Ostlie, like Moyer but unlike the present invention, also relates to a radiation curable composition. And also like Moyer, there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure in Ostlie that would motivate one skilled in the art to replace the radiation curing mechanism of Ostlie with oxidative drying. Neither would a skilled artisan desiring

an improved oxidatively drying coating composition look to the radiation curable coating of Ostile, either alone or in combination with the radiation curable coating of Moyer.

Applicant notes claims 4 and 6 were objected to in the Office Action as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but are stated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. As base claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the prior art for the reasoning set forth above, claims 4 and 6 are believed to be allowable as dependent claims.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michelle J. Burke
Reg. No. 37791
Attorney for Applicant

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
7 Livingstone Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408
(914) 674-5459